



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A comparison of the *editio princeps* with the latest reprints,—I have in view especially Kressner's edition in the *Bibliothek Spanischer Schriftsteller*, Leipzig, 1890, will show how defective the text of *Lazarillo* is in the editions that are accessible. Kressner, in his introduction, says:

"The text has been restored in accordance with the Antwerp edition of 1602, in the possession of the editor, which edition is a careful reimpression of the first edition."

He evidently considers the Antwerp edition of 1554 as the first edition; but in any event his text differs widely from that of the Burgos imprint of 1554.

The words of Morel-Fatio, expressed nearly ten years ago, may well conclude what has been said:

"Le moment semble venu de réimprimer correctement la célèbre nouvelle, en l'entourant d'un commentaire sobre et solide dont elle ne saurait guère se passer. L'érudit qui se chargerait de cette tâche aurait à se pourvoir d'une copie de l'édition de Burgos, 1554, qu'il rapprocherait de celle d'Alcalá de la même année et des premières éditions anversoises, en ayant toujours sous les yeux et le texte expurgé de 1573, à cause de ses corrections, et le remaniement de Luna. C'est en Angleterre seulement qu'un tel travail pourrait être exécuté."

Grateful as all students of Spanish literature must be to Mr. Clark for his excellent reprint of *Lazarillo*, let us hope that at no distant day he may favor us with the critical edition of which M. Morel-Fatio speaks, and for which Mr. Clark is so well fitted.

HUGO A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

NORWEGIAN GRAMMAR AND READER.

Norwegian Grammar and Reader, with Notes and Vocabulary. By JULIUS E. OLSON, Professor of Scandinavian Languages and Literature in the University of Wisconsin. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. x+330.

THIS last Norwegian Grammar, as we are told in the preface, is designed not only for the

The latter title, instead of *conde de los Arcos* is a mistake of Cabrera's, as Morel-Fatio shows (p. 123) that the title of *Conde de Arcos* ceased to exist after 1493.

5 *Op. cit.*, p. 140.

classroom and for those who wish to acquire a knowledge of the language of Norway, but also to serve as a guide to those "who having some knowledge of spoken Norwegian desire to know something of Norwegian literature." The author discards the longer name Dano-Norwegian for the shorter Norwegian on the ground that:

"The literary activity that Norway has experienced, especially during the last forty years, has developed many peculiarities quite foreign to Danish."

With the exception of one or two brief notes, the whole grammar concerns itself only with the literary language of Norway, but this literary vernacular, that of Ibsen and Björnson, as well as that of Kjelland and Lie, is in all essentials Danish. The chief difference between it and the Danish of Denmark is perhaps found in the pronunciation—that of modern Danish being peculiarly characterized by the glottal catch. The latter is also much more corrupt than the literary language of Norway. It is true, a great many words and idioms have crept in, in Norway, from the dialects, but it remains, nevertheless, at best Dano-Norwegian.

If we are treating of the "language of Norway" we must, however, bear in mind the importance of the dialects. They are an endless source from which the literary language is constantly drawing and enriching itself. This is true not only of the vocabulary. There is a certain point and conciseness of expression in the dialects of Norway that is not found in the older literary language. Writers have recognized this, and through them these dialectic peculiarities have, for a long time, gradually been finding their way into the literature. The influence of the dialects on the literary language also extends to pronunciation. These dialects are spoken throughout all Norway to-day, and they are, after all, the actual living descendants of the language that was spoken in Norway before the Union of Calmar. It has for three centuries lived on and developed, preserving many of the characteristics of the older language. It has, furthermore, in our own century developed a literature hand in hand with what, by way of distinction, may be termed Dano-Norwegian; and in the last years Arne Garborg, the most

prominent writer of dialect, has played an important part in the literary movement of Norway. It is to be regretted that this phase of the language and literature of Norway has been so wholly neglected in Professor Olson's *Grammar and Reader*. Out of one hundred and seventeen pages devoted to the *Reader*, only five are given to the dialect writers. In the *Grammar* the dialects have not been taken into consideration, although frequently it would have been desirable to have had dialectic variations illustrated.

"In conformity with the essential idea of the book, that of being an introduction to the literature of Norway," the author has devoted one hundred and ninety-one pages to the *Reader, Notes and Vocabulary*, leaving one hundred and thirty-nine for the grammatical introduction. To determine how well the double purpose of the book has been accomplished, let us first turn to the *Grammar*.

The *Grammar* is not complete, nor does the author claim that. He has found that the limited space allowed to it made eliminations necessary. The usual exercises for translation have been omitted, but, on the contrary, example sentences illustrative of the practical application of grammatical rules are found on almost every page throughout the book. Perhaps too much space has been devoted to this; as, for instance, when the greater part of a page is given to the modal auxiliary *kunne*—fourteen sentences to show the three distinct usages; or, again, when a little over nine pages are devoted to the adverb alone. Such a large number of example sentences is superfluous, especially as in many of these cases the usage is identical. The illustrative sentences are generally well-chosen and good idiomatic Norwegian is rendered into good idiomatic English, to which statement there is an exception on p. 69: "Med Lov skal land bygges," rendered "with law shall the land be built." The phraseology throughout is excellent and to the point, such clumsy statements as the following being extremely rare: "Words with the prefix *be*, *er*, *ge*, never have the accent on the first syllable, while those with *for* and *u* often do."

The treatment of the inflections is good; the phonology is not so satisfactory. The rules

for usage are sometimes too ironbound and exceptions that are not at all unusual have sometimes been ignored. At times, the author has recorded but one usage when there is distinctly a duality of usage. Thus under the diphthong *ei* we are told:

"*e* before *gn* and *gl*, when these consonants belong together in the root of a word, has, with few exceptions, the same sound as the diphthong *ei*, the *g* being silent, or, rather, fused in the *e*."

Egn and *Tegn*, hence, are pronounced *Ein*, *Tein*. But they are also pronounced *Engn* and *Tengn*, and this latter pronunciation is extremely common.

In the classification of vowels and consonants the terminology is not always in accord with that established by recent works on phonology. Such terms as 'back' and 'front' vowels are even for the beginner more intelligible than "hard" and "soft." Phonetic values are not always acutely differentiated. The closed long *o*, we are told, "has the sound of our *oo* in 'food,' uttered with a more decided projecting of the lips than is usual." This is not true. Norwegian long closed *o* has much more of the distinctly *ø* element than is found in *oo* in 'food,' and this quality is not given it by the lips, but by the tongue. As to manner of production, the *o* in *Fod* and the *oo* in 'food' are both back-narrow-round vowels, but while *oo* is a high-back, the *o* in *Fod* is almost a mid-back-round vowel. The vowel in *Fod*, then, is much more like that we hear in 'low' than that in 'food.' And so with the short *o* and *u*, both of which we are told are nearly like *oo* in 'foot.' The difference is not so inconsiderable. The vowel that we hear in *bort* is one quite different from that of *Gut*. That of *Bonde* is quite different from that of *Hund* (if we exclude the dialect pronunciation of the latter, which is *hond* [*u* in 'pull']). The phonetic value of *o* in *Bonde* and *bort* is very near that of *o* in 'forth.' Now, in English, when we change from 'pool' to 'pull' we widen the vowel, so that the vowel we have in 'pull' is not a pure *u* at all, but one in which the *o* element is very prominent. This widening process in changing from long *u* to short *u* does not take place in Norwegian, or, at least, only to an almost imperceptible degree, so that the

vowel in *Gut* differs from that of the dialectic *Güt* only in quantity. There is, then, in the literary language quite a difference between the vowels in *bort* and *Gut*, the short *o* and the short *u*.

The first element of the diphthong *ei* is broader than *a* in 'age.' The short open *o* is approximately the London *o* in 'not,' our *o* in 'lost.' *Jeg, mig, dig, sig*, we are told may be approximated by the English 'yea,' 'may,' 'day,' 'say,' "quickly pronounced with a slight suggestion of an *ee* sound at the close." Norwegian *jeg, mig, dig, sig* may be almost perfectly represented by 'yea,' 'may,' 'day,' 'say,' as often pronounced in Philadelphia,—that is, the *a* is slightly broadened and the vanish is introduced.¹

Under *ö* we find the following erroneous statement: "Before *gn*, *ö* has the sound of the diphthong *öi*, the *g* becoming silent." The fact is, *g* is simply palatalized after a palatal vowel and so *ög* becomes *öi*, just as *jeg* becomes *jei*. This note on *ö* before *gn* should, for the sake of system, have come under *öi*, since *e* before *gn* was considered under the diphthong *ei*.

V is generally silent after *l* in *Sölv*, *halv*, *tolv*, but it is extremely rare to hear *selv* pronounced 'sel.' If the *v* is dropped in *selv*, the *e* is generally lengthened by compensation and *s* receives the sound of our *sh* in 'shoe.'

The bulk of the *Grammar* is devoted to inflections, and this part is very good. In connection with the inchoative verb it would have been in place to state that the verbs in *ne* (Goth. *nan*) are historically the inchoative verbs, and that the *s*-inchoative is distinctly a Norse peculiarity.

It would have been desirable to have had a fuller treatment of the abbreviated verbs, especially as this is a distinguishing characteristic of the Northern tongues. The author has given us a list of those commonly used, twelve in all, but many have been omitted that are used in the abbreviated form as much as in the full form; for instance, *at blö*, *at gli*, *at klæ*, *at dra*, *at ska*, etc. There are, besides, a number of other verbs in which assimilation has for a long time characterized the past participle, but can, as yet, hardly be

¹ Cf. Norw. diphthong *ei* (æi).

said to have transferred itself to the infinitive, as: *at dölgje*, *du(lg)t*, *vælgje*, *val(g)t*, etc.

As an introduction to the literature of Norway, the book is admirable, both from the felicity of the various extracts selected for translation and the character of the notes accompanying them; there are, however, some inexplicable omissions. Taken together the prose and the poetry of the selections form an excellent picture of Norwegian literature since 1814. Almost every phase of what in many ways has been an astonishing development is duly considered, and out of Norway, at least, this is the best and most comprehensive anthology that has been brought together. Not an important name or movement is actually absent, from Welhaven and Wergeland of the Norwegian "Storm and Stress," down by way of Asbjørnsen and Moe, the collectors of folk tales, and the historians Keyser and Munch, all of whom paved the way by suggestion for much that was to follow, to the coryphæi: Björnson, Ibsen and Jonas Lie. The lesser voices of the chorus have also not been neglected; and last, but not least in actual importance, we are given a glimpse of the dialect writers, Aasen, Garborg and Per Sivle.

With but two exceptions, there is little to find fault with, either in the choice of the material as representative of the several writers, or in its relative arrangement to give an intelligible picture of the whole. Ibsen is represented by four lyrics, among them one from *Brand* and another from *Peer Gynt*, two public speeches, and a short fragment, four pages in all, from the *Pretenders*. This last is not only all there is of Ibsen's dramas, but the only exemplification of Norwegian dramatic writing in the book, when, in point of fact, no phase of the new literature has attracted more attention outside of Norway than the drama, and Ibsen's modern social dramas, in particular, are in many ways the most remarkable productions in all Norwegian literature.

Another omission, even more disappointing, is the extremely scant space given to the writers of popular dialect, to which attention has already been called. This, it seems to us, is a lost opportunity, both in the *Grammar* and the *Reader*. The few examples given of

dialect are all short lyrics, although some of the strongest and most picturesque prose of Norway, like that, for instance, of the novels of Arne Garborg, is written in the popular speech, which is after all the only real Norwegian.

Out and out the best part of Professor Olson's book are the *Notes* on the literary extracts. These are altogether admirable. They are not only lucid and pertinent, but they display an intimate knowledge of the subject in all its bearings. They form in themselves an extremely good 'introduction to Norwegian literature,' in that they extend the study, by reference and suggestion, far out beyond the covers of this book.

The few faults of omission and of commission that we have noted do not weigh seriously in the balance against the undoubted value of the book, which will in most cases well fulfill the purpose for which it is intended. In view of the author's treatment of the subject it should, nevertheless, still have had, however "cumbersome and awkward," according to him it may be, the term 'Dano-Norwegian,' instead of "Norwegian," upon the title-page.

WM. H. CARPENTER.

GEO. T. FLOM.

Columbia University.

DANTE.

The Divine Comedy of Dante, translated by HENRY F. CARY, together with DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI's translation of *The New Life*; edited, with introduction and notes, by OSCAR KUHN, Professor in Wesleyan University, author of *The Treatment of Nature in Dante*. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York and Boston: 1897, pp. xxxiv, 476.

It is not necessary to praise these standard translations, but the editor is to be congratulated on his happy idea of printing them together and annotating them more copiously. Persons ignorant of Italian who undertake to read the Divine Comedy in an English translation often give up the attempt in despair of understanding the poem. Of those who persist to the end, many, acknowledging a feeling of disappointment, wonder if the fault is in them or in the translator, or whether Dante

has not been overestimated. The trouble is partly, of course, that they miss the incommunicable music of the original, which no translation can reproduce. But it is partly also because they expect to read Dante too rapidly, and because the English texts are not sufficiently provided with notes. When one is reading Dante in Italian, one proceeds very slowly and makes a study of each allusion, personal, mythological, theological, or other, employing the vast critical apparatus provided by six centuries of commentators. Professor Kuhns' volume has two very valuable features: it includes the *Vita Nuova*, which is more essential to an understanding of the *Divina Commedia* than any commentary; and also foot-notes to the text. Some of these notes are necessary for the rectification of Cary's errors in interpretation. Without help of this kind Cary's translation, in spite of its acknowledged poetical value, would become obsolete. The notes are even not numerous enough. There is no use reading Dante unless one tries to understand him, and while it makes a prettier book to print a translation with only here and there an almost casual note, as is the case with Professor Norton's, the reader must often be baffled. Longfellow's translation, too, with its notes not elucidative but only illustrative, is in a hundred places more difficult than the original. The excellence of Rossetti's translation of the *Vita Nuova* and of Cary's translation of the *Divina Commedia*, their publication in one volume, and the notes to both, by Professor Kuhns, make this a book one can recommend. It is a pity, however, that Professor Kuhns did not write a more substantial introduction than the rather flimsy lecture which he puts in such terribly dangerous juxtaposition to these more solid things.

GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER.

Princeton University.

MY LEOUE LEFDI.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the January number of the current volume of your journal, col. 64, Professor Brandl is charged with inaccuracy in his account of *On god ureisun of ure lefdi*. Brandl's words:

"Der Dichter gibt sich da mit individueller Unmittelbarkeit, als Mönch, welcher der Gottesmutter alles geopfert hat und sie dafür seine liebe Frau nennt . . ."

are opposed by the surprising dictum: "The poet nowhere calls her 'seine Frau' . . ."; and, as a result of this strange delusion, Brandl's whole summary appears to his critic in a wrong light. The fact is that the poet does call the Virgin a number of times, "mi leoue lefdi" ("mi swete lefdi," "mi leoue